



	Page 3
1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	ROPES & GRAY LLP
4	Attorneys for Plan Administrator
5	1211 Avenue of the Americas
6	New York, NY 10036
7	
8	BY: GREGG M. GALARDI
9	KIMBERLY J. KODIS
10	
11	COHEN & GRESSER LLP
12	Counsel for Terry Bollea
13	800 Third Avenue
14	New York, NY 10022
15	
16	BY: DANIEL H. TABAK
17	
18	DORSEY
19	51 West 52nd Street
20	New York, NY 10019
21	
22	BY: JESSICA D. MIKHAILEVICH
23	
24	
25	

Page 5 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 MR. GALARDI: Good morning, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Good morning. 4 MR. GALARDI: For the record, Gregg Galardi on 5 behalf of the plan administrator. The only matter on the 6 agenda today for Gawker is the -- your -- our motion for 7 approval of a sale of the remaining what we call the Gawker 8 assets. 9 Your Honor, with respect to the sale of assets, there are two people in the courtroom today that I'll --10 11 unless Your Honor would want to proceed direct, I would end 12 up proffering their testimony? 13 THE COURT: Go ahead. Because there's a lot of 14 factual findings in your order that I don't have any 15 evidence to support. 16 MR. GALARDI: We'll take those up as you -- as we 17 go, Your Honor. But with respect to the actual evidence for today's factual findings, one is I would refer Your Honor to 18 19 Docket Number 1150, which was the auction transcript that 20 was submitted to the Court. That is the transcript of the 21 specific auction that was held in our offices on the --22 THE COURT: Well, for example, you have a finding at Paragraph E about notice. How do I know that --23 24 MR. GALARDI: Your Honor --25 THE COURT: -- was the notice you gave?

MR. GALARDI: Your Honor --

THE COURT: There's no reference to the certificates of service.

MR. GALARDI: And Your Honor, we would put in -and I was going to ask Your Honor to take judicial notice of
two other docket numbers. One is Docket Number 1144, which
is notice of the service of the executory contracts and
Docket Number 1146 which is the notice of the sale hearing.

Your Honor, at Docket Number 1150 Your Honor also has, and we did make reference to this, judicial notice can be taken of the transcript of the bid procedures hearing, which was held on June 20th, which also put forth notice.

THE COURT: But those are just a list of names.

How do I know, for example, that those are the people on the 2002 list? You know, you're asking me to make a specific finding that you served all people who filed a notice of appearance. If I just look at names, I don't know that to be the case.

MR. GALARDI: Well, actually, I think it's more broken down by that. And if we can -- again, Your Honor, if the claims agent makes a representation that they served all of the people and you correspond that to the 2002 list, I have not gone back, quite honestly, to look at the certificate of service, but I believe they break it down by the kind of parties that they do and who they serve. And

Page 7 1 that's the claims agent who is an agent of the court to 2 serve those people who are on the 2002 list. They do the 3 regular service, so that's why I give you the docket number, it's 1144 and 1146, because those are the court approved 4 5 persons. I don't go back and check each one, but that's 6 their job --7 THE COURT: But I should do that, huh? MR. GALARDI: -- to service that. No, Your Honor, 8 9 but you shouldn't do it. 10 THE COURT: Okay. 11 MR. GALARDI: But certificates of service for a 12 claims agent who's hired as the arm of the bankruptcy court 13 to serve all purpose -- people on the 2002 list, who is 14 directed to do so, would send the notice to those persons on 15 the service list. 16 As to serving, also, the auction transcript, the 17 notice of designation of successful bidder, all of those are the claims agent's job. And unless someone challenges that 18 they don't do the job, and you look at the names, they serve 19 20 the people on the 2002 list. If I need to bring the claims 21 agent in, we'll, you know, do that. 22 THE COURT: Why don't you just refer to the 23 certificates of service and say it's good and adequate 24 service? 25 MR. GALARDI: That's fine.

Page 8 1 THE COURT: I'm not --2 MR. GALARDI: That's fine. 3 THE COURT: -- suggesting --MR. GALARDI: I understand, Your Honor. 4 5 THE COURT: I'm not suggesting that you didn't 6 make adequate service. All I'm saying is, if I looked at 7 the certificate of service I couldn't make the specific 8 findings that you have in here. 9 MR. GALARDI: That's fine. Your Honor, we can 10 modify that, if Your Honor's preference is to refer to the 11 certificate of services and that we believe that that is 12 good and adequate notice as we believe that it covered the 13 2002 list, interested parties, et cetera. We certainly can 14 make those modifications. 15 With respect to the sale itself, Your Honor, Your 16 Honor does have a transcript in front -- that has been 17 filed, which is the auction transcript. THE COURT: I don't have that. All I -- I ran off 18 the -- what do you call it, the sale order that you sent, 19 20 but I didn't get the documents you filed yesterday. 21 MR. GALARDI: If I may approach, Your Honor? 22 THE COURT: Sure. Thanks. 23 MR. GALARDI: Your Honor, what I've handed up and 24 what was also filed, along with a number of other documents 25 last Friday with the notice of the designation which is the

Docket Number 1150, is the notice of the -- which is the transcript of the actual auction that was conducted in our offices.

THE COURT: Were there any other bidders?

MR. GALARDI: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: How many bidders were there?

MR. GALARDI: Your Honor, there was the stalking horse bidder, and as set forth in that auction transcript, as Mr. Holden would testify, we received one bid prior to the deadline on Monday of last week with respect to an overbid. That bid was a qualifying overbid by the number set forth in the bid procedures. That is by the BDG GMGI Acquisition.

Then we received another bid on I think it was Wednesday morning that was executed and deposit received by a company called Online Logo Maker, LLC.

As required by the settlement with Mr. Bollea, we consulted with Mr. Bollea about whether or not we should accept that higher or otherwise bid and allow that person to participate in the auction, despite the fact that it was a bid that came in after the bid deadline. We also consulted with -- although the administrator doesn't have to have approval from, they -- we also consulted with our equity holders and determined that in light of that bid satisfying all the requirements, a deposit being put in, and it being a

Page 10 bid that satisfied the qualified bid, and that the person had the financial wherewithal, we decided to extend the deadline and allow that person to participate in the auction. THE COURT: How much was the winning bid? MR. GALARDI: The winning bid was, as reflected in that, \$1.35 million. THE COURT: And what was the stalking horse contract? MR. GALARDI: The stalking horse was, I think we had two rounds of bids, so it was in the 1.035 range, I believe is the number, Your Honor. THE COURT: So you got another \$300,000? MR. GALARDI: Three hundred minus -- we got roughly two rounds of bids and we received about, after paying off the break-up fee, about an 100, \$150,000 in bids. Your Honor, so when we conducted the auction, we had three bidders present at the auction in our offices, reflected by the auction transcript. As a result of BDG GMGI's acquisition being both timely and satisfying all the requirements, we deemed that, and knowing more about its financial wherewithal, we deemed that to be the highest and bed bid, as set forth in the auction transcript. And as Mr. Holden would testify, we then set forth the rules of the

That higher and better bid by BDG was also agreed

auction.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

to by Mr. Bollea.

We then asked the questions whether the bidders would agree, which the stalking horse had not agreed, whether anyone would stand in place to be the back-up bidder. All of the bidders agreed to be -- stand in place with the back-up bidder. All of the bidders also agreed and we set a closing date of August 2nd for the transaction. And we set that the 2nd back-up bidder would then stay open for a period of seven days following that as set forth in the auction.

We then commenced the auction with the -- what we deemed to be the lower bid at that point, the stalking horse bidder. As reflected in that instance, the stalking horse bidder did not make another bid. We had a two pass rule. Then Online Logo Maker did make a bid. That was then followed by a higher bid by BBG. The stalking horse didn't bid and then everybody passed and that's how we arrived at the number \$1.35 million. So two rounds of bidding followed along with the initial overbid, so that's roughly \$150,000 or \$100,000 increase in the bid.

At the conclusion all the parties passed and we announced that BBG GMGI, which was the timely overbid filed on the Monday, was the highest and best bid and concluded the auction.

With respect to BBGMI and with respect to Mr.

Holden's efforts, this was the culmination of efforts that we would try to incorporate by reference to his testimony and his proffer at the bid procedures hearing. But just a quick summary, after going out to over 150 parties last -- in the last -- after the bid procedures hearing approved the stalking horse bid, there was five to ten that were interested, as I've just stated to the Court, ultimately two incremental bids, three bidders at the auction, and the auction was conducted. It was a rather short auction, but it was conducted and no one had any objections.

The documents and the asset purchase agreements were essentially identical on all terms. We spent some days from Monday to the auction conforming the agreement of BDG GMGI but it was not a material change, it was really how the break-up fee would work for the payment.

With respect to BDG GMGI, Your Honor had asked about this the last time, but we should put the following, and Ms. Schwartz here is the CFO, and I'll put on a very short proffer as to their adequate assurance.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. GALARDI: BDG GMGI Acquisition is a subsidiary of BDG Media, Inc. BDG Media, Inc.'s current valuation is approximately or over \$195 million. It has cash on its balance sheet of \$12 million. It has 240 employees. It has strategic partners and venture capitalists invested in that,

including Time Warner, Sabine and others, and expects -last year it had over \$45 million in revenues and expects to
have over \$75 million in revenues this year.

BDGI as a business is a digital content corporation that owns websites and associated social media. Its brands include Bustle, ROMPER, Elite Daily and The Zoe Report. And its intentions with respect to Gawker are to do a relaunch of it, but to do so with certain, you know, editorial changes which will be in its discretion.

And that it -- and at this point, Your Honor, with respect to adequate assurance, to fill in their financial wherewithal to meet the contracts, Mr. Holden would testify that approximately, currently the operations and those contracts that are being assigned, not assumed, we did that in the context of the plan, cost about \$100,000 a year to operate, and there's maybe \$100,000 of maintenance. So we have no objections. They were -- received notice of both the bid, the auction, the successful bidder. We've not had any contacts, we've had no objections from any parties. But we believe that BDG Media and BDG GMGI Acquisition, the actual acquiring entity, has the financial wherewithal, has the experience and is more than able to perform the contracts as they are assigned.

Your Honor, with respect to the business judgment,
Mr. Holden would testify that in his view, after having

solicited the bids, and as we talked a little bit about the bids procedures hearing, he does believe that now is the time to sell the assets of the company. We had discussed, with Mr. Bollea, as Mr. Holden would testify, possibly withdrawing the assets. You'll even see a reference to that in the auction transcript. I will say that there are certain equity holders that we had talked about who we -the 55 percent of the contingent, who would have preferred not to proceed with the sale. We did suggest to them if they wanted to not proceed with the sale they can come up with an economic arrangement to do so, to take it off, to sort of backstop the price, because we were going to auction and had the price. We have received no offers or further objections in that regard, so we believed that -- so that at this point, and Mr. Holden would testify, that in his business judgment this is the proper time to sell the assets.

He would also note that in the event that we chose to withdraw the assets we would be probably in some litigation with Mr. Bollea because Mr. Bollea also believes that now is the time to sell the assets. We did approach them about that, and there was relatively little interest in proceeding, at that time, on another course.

So in Mr. Holden's judgment, and as Your Honor knows under the plan Mr. Holden is the plan administrator

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

with the authority to sell these assets, and after consulting with those people who have an economic interest, and offering those people who have an economic interest to backstop what would have been walking away from a transaction, not receiving that, having no objections, and having no formal objections filed, Mr. Holden would request, and believes it's in the best interest of these cases, to sell these assets.

This is the last asset of the case. It will also allow us to close up the case in a timely fashion and believes that it's in the best interest to do so.

With respect to any relationships between BDG and Gawker or the plan administrator or formal -- former members of the board of directors, Mr. Holden would also testify that there are no relationships with any of the former. They are not insiders, none of the acquirers are insiders. There has been no interest, there has been no attempt, that we are aware of, to at all impede or otherwise collude to keep the price of the bid lower. The auction, I think, also reflects that there was an auction, a market check on these, and we just simply didn't get as much as we might otherwise have liked.

Ms. Schwartz would also, if called to testify, would also testify that none of the BDG acquisition or any of the BDG Media persons are insiders or affiliated with any

Page 16 1 of the Gawker entities. Indeed they were in existence prior 2 to --3 THE COURT: Or the plan administrator, I assume? MR. GALARDI: Or the plan administrator, correct, 4 5 Your Honor. So there is no insider transactions. 6 Ms. -- they would also testify, and Mr. Holden 7 would testify, and I know this goes to findings, that all of the bidders have made proposals that had to be free and 8 9 clear of any liens, claims and encumbrances. Right now we 10 don't know of claims and encumbrances because all of these 11 are unsecured assets, but they are taking free and clear. 12 Another aspect of both of the transactions, Mr. Holden would testify, and why we think this sale is in the 13 14 best --15 THE COURT: Is that why you had the phrase "free 16 and clear" nine times in the order? 17 MR. GALARDI: People were concerned about it, and 18 that's probably why it's nine times --19 THE COURT: Well, I --20 MR. GALARDI: -- in the order. 21 THE COURT: -- crossed out the next eight, once I 22 read it once. 23 MR. GALARDI: Excuse me? 24 THE COURT: I will cross out the next eight times. 25 MR. GALARDI: I understood that, and I looked at

it and I had -- well, there's the findings and there's the order, so I'd ask you to wait till after the second one.

But, Your Honor, I understand.

With respect to -- oh, and one other aspect of this which believes Mr. Holden would testify why it's in the best interest of the company to close the sale at this time is that all of the bidders agreed to an archive agreement whereby the archives could remain. We are going to enter into an archive agreement so that the Gawker archives are available.

about taking down articles and concerns, that's why we were concerned about that. We did provide notice -- some of our equity members mentioned that they were concerned about it, we did provide notice, and I specifically reached out to counsel, who you're aware of, with the employees and the writers to say, if you have concerns about this, we cannot be the safeguard of the articles any longer, it's going to new hands. They appreciated that, but took no action. We have no objections. They understand that that is a risk, although we hope, and one of the reasons we protected the archives, that the articles main up, is that they will still have access to that information on the Internet.

I don't know if Your Honor has other questions or wants to go through the order and --

Page 18 1 THE COURT: Well, we'll go through the order in a 2 minute. Let me ask if anyone wants to, first of all object 3 to what is essentially a proffer of Mr. Holden's testimony and Ms. -- is it Ms. Schwartz -- Ms. Schwartz's testimony, 4 5 or wants to cross examine either witness? Hearing no 6 response, I'll accept the proffer as the evidence at the 7 hearing. Does anybody want to be heard with respect to the 8 9 transaction or any other matter relating to the transaction? 10 MR. GALARDI: And Your Honor, just to give a 11 precise number, and Mr. Tabak was nice enough to pull it 12 out, the precise number of the stalking horse bid was 13 \$1,131,600 and there was \$150 million of bid protection but 14 the bids went through. 15 MAN: Slightly less. 16 THE COURT: One hundred and fifty thousand, I 17 assume. 18 MR. GALARDI: A -- yes, \$150,000 total break-up 19 fee (indiscernible). 20 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Does anybody 21 else want to be heard? 22 All right. I'll approve the transaction. familiar with the marketing efforts which were set -- which 23 have been set out on the record, both in litigation and in 24 25 connection with the sale motion and the issues that arose in

connection with the marketing efforts. So I'm satisfied that the marketing was adequate. And since this was a competitive auction, this is the best evidence of what a fair and reasonable price is. So I'll approve the transaction.

I think, Mr. Galardi, that your order is unnecessarily long. And the longer it is, the longer it will take me to go through it, because I read every word and I cross out a lot.

I think the evidentiary findings that you want are set forth in our form order that we have online, which are sufficient.

If the contract, which I'm approving provides for somebody to do something, you don't have to put it in the order. I'm approving the contract and I'm authorizing the plan administrator to perform the contract, and that's all you really need.

There's a lot of -- there's several findings here relating to the compelling circumstances of the sale. I don't know why you need this. This was an adequately noticed sale, it's a post-confirmation sale.

I don't think there are any Lionel issues. All I really have to decide, based on the evidence, is that it's an appropriate exercise of business judgment to sell the asset to the buyer. And for the reasons that you've

articulated, and I've accepted as part of the record, that's sufficient.

With respect to your "free and clear" language, I have two comments. First of all, does anybody else have an interest in these assets? I know that Mr. Bollea has an interest in the income stream, I don't know if that's an assignment or an equitable interest or what. But who else has an interest in these assets?

MR. GALARDI: Your Honor, there may be parties who have asserted, over time, some interest. For example, copywrite people, and we -- they've been noticed. So they may say, oh, well this is a copyrighted photo or something like that.

So it's that kind of concern where people seem to come out of the woodwork in these cases, that is why it's necessary to protect those kinds of interests. They've been noticed, they've been watching the Gawker case, they've reached out to us. So we think we do need that language.

THE COURT: All right. You have a free and clear provision for the assignment of the contracts. But there's no free and clear provision in Section 365. Where does that come from?

MR. GALARDI: Your Honor, but again, it's also a sale of a contract. So to the extent it's a sale --

THE COURT: So what's the difference between an

Page 21 1 assignment and a sale? That's one I pondered for many 2 years, since I read that decision, I forget the case, but --MR. GALARDI: Well, I mean, an assignment can just 3 be an assignment without cash, without consideration. 4 5 could assign rights under a contract, you can also buy the 6 right and assign it to them. So I think that there are differences. I'm not -- you know, metaphysically at this 7 8 point I'm not going to say much more than that. 9 THE COURT: Well --10 MR. GALARDI: But I have seen cases, for example, 11 when you have leases where people have rights on mortgages 12 that you want to both sell and assign those rights so that 13 you can get it free and clear of that mortgage. And I've 14 seen mortgagees object on those grounds. 15 So that's they that kind of language is usually in 16 there. You do two things with contracts. 17 THE COURT: Okay. I never thought of a mortgage 18 as an executory contract, but --19 MR. GALARDI: No, but it can be a lien on a 20 contract, right? You can have rights as a mortgagee, and if 21 you want to sell a lease --22 THE COURT: Oh, I see. 23 MR. GALARDI: -- subject to or free and clear of 24 that, you can try to sell free and clear of that. 25 I question whether you can do that, THE COURT:

Page 22 1 but --2 MR. GALARDI: I understand you question it. I've 3 seen people do it and I've seen disputes about it through my 4 years. 5 THE COURT: All right. Again, the sale is 6 approved for the reasons I've stated. I would suggest you 7 come back with a more concise order. 8 MR. GALARDI: We will do so, obviously, Your 9 Honor. It's also --THE COURT: I will -- you know, I will read 10 11 whatever you give me --12 MR. GALARDI: I know you will. 13 THE COURT: -- it just takes longer to read a long 14 (indiscernible) redundant order. 15 MR. GALARDI: We will try to shorten it and work 16 with the buyer --17 THE COURT: Okay. I think you --18 MR. GALARDI: -- and the back-up bidder for that, 19 Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: -- ought to go back to our proposed 21 orders which are in our guidelines. 22 MR. GALARDI: That's fine, Your Honor. We will 23 start --THE COURT: All right. Thank you --24 25 MR. GALARDI: -- there, but I appreciate it.

Page 23 THE COURT: -- very much. Good luck. MR. GALARDI: Thank you. Thank you. (Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at 10:45 AM)

	Pg 24 of 25			
			Page 24	
1	INDEX			
2				
3	RULINGS			
4		Page	Line	
5	Sale transaction	22	5	
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

Page 25 1 CERTIFICATION 2 3 I, Sonya Ledanski Hyde, certified that the foregoing 4 transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. 5 Digitally signed by Sonya Ledanski Sonya Hyde 6 DN: cn=Sonya Ledanski Hyde, o, ou, email=digital1@veritext.com, c=US Date: 2018.07.24 16:50:31 -04'00' 7 8 Sonya Ledanski Hyde 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 Veritext Legal Solutions 20 21 330 Old Country Road 22 Suite 300 23 Mineola, NY 11501 24 25 Date: July 24, 2018